

REMARK

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The non-final Office Action dated May 14, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 12 is hereby amended and claim 16 is hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claim 12 is pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 12 and 16 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendment in claim 12 and the cancellation of claim 16, this objection is now believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the cancellation of claim 16, this rejection is now believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002-098979 to Sotozono (hereinafter “Sotozono”) in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 60-003609 to Hirokazu (hereinafter “Hirokazu”). Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 64-73323 to Ogami (hereinafter “Ogami”) in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 60-003609 to Hirokazu (hereinafter “Hirokazu”).

The rejection of claims 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotozono in view of Hirokazu is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The rejection of claims 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogami in view of Hirokazu is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 is allowable in that it recites “dispensing sealant onto the image display parts in one line or column by operating simultaneously a plurality of syringes while the table is held in a fixed position”, “dispensing sealant onto the image display parts in other lines or columns by operating simultaneously a plurality of syringes while the table is held in a fixed position”, and “wherein the number of the syringes for each line or column corresponds to the number of the image display parts in each line or column.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the claimed invention, the image display parts are arranged in at least two row or column and the size of the image display parts in one row or column is different from that in other row or column. Further, in the claimed invention, the sealant is dispensed at the image display parts in one line or column by the syringes corresponding to the number of the image display part in one line or column and then the sealant is again dispensed at the image display parts in other line or column by the syringes corresponding to the number of the image display part in one line or column. At this time, the syringes are simultaneously driven to dispense the sealant onto the image display parts in one line or column.

On the contrary, Sotonozo merely disclosed the method of dispensing the sealant onto the substrate by syringe and Hirokazu merely disclosed the substrate including a plurality panels having different sizes. Further, Ogami merely disclosed the dispenser for dispensing the sealant onto the substrate.

Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least “dispensing sealant onto the image display parts in one line or column by operating simultaneously a plurality of syringes while the table is held in a fixed position”, “dispensing sealant onto the image display parts in other lines or columns by operating simultaneously a plurality of syringes while the table is held in a fixed position”, and “wherein the number of the syringes for each line or column corresponds to the number of the image display parts in each line or column.”

In Office Action, the Examiner stated “Sotozono teaches that a single syringe can be used, but does not explicitly teach using a plurality of syringes and that all the syringes are operated at the same time. However, one of ordinary skill the art would have recognized that the use of multiple syringes would have reduced the time required for dispensing the sealant, with the

providing of a syringe for each display being the most efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have provided a plurality of syringes in the process of Sotozono such that one syringe corresponds to each image display part with a reasonable expectation of success. One would have been motivated to do so in order to have improved manufacturing efficiency and decreased costs.” See Office Action, lines 17-25 page 4.

However, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner’s statement. As described above, in the claimed invention the syringes for the image display parts of one line or column and the syringes for the image display parts of other line or column are driven at different time. That is, in the claimed invention all the syringes are not driven at the same time and the syringes are driven at the same time or at the different time according to the arrangement and size of the image display parts. Thus, it would have not been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

In addition, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above-noted feature of the claimed invention. As pointed out in MPEP §2143.03, “all claim limitations must be taught or suggested.” Thus, “to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974).” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over the cited references.

Since the rejected claim 16 is cancelled, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps

necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant